The portion of the article which most intrigued me was the question of, "What types/kinds of experiences matter for authors in writing culturally ethnic groups?". I believe that this section of the article pertains most to debate that we held in class with Todd. It was interesting to see that many of the issues brought up in our class debate were also reflected as key points/challenges in the article, a specific issue being whether or not an "insider" of a particular culture needs significant, prolonged experiences within that culture, or if intense, culturally sensitive research would suffice. Sims- Bishop (who, for some reason, I have grown to dislike), states that in order for an author who has written from an outsider’s perspective to be considered authentic, they must make some sort of documentation in their book of the types of "real" experiences they have had within that said culture. I do not believe this to be the case. I believe that there are no specific "cultural credentials" that authors need to possess in order to write about another group of people; no matter what types of experiences they have had (whether it be personal or research based) as long as an author has done everything in their power to represent a particular culture to the best of their ability, I strongly believe that they need no type of verification of their experiences. In short, I believe that Sims- Bishop's idea of "proof of experience" is ridiculous.